

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 49 and 50 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 3, 5-8, 11, 13-22, 24, 25 and 27-48 are canceled by this amendment. Claims 49 and 50 are added as new claims. No new matter has been added. Applicants note that claims 49 and 50 correspond to the elected invention.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification and abstract for grammatical and general readability purposes. Due to the number of changes made, a substitute specification and abstract are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added. Also enclosed is a marked-up copy of the original specification and abstract showing the changes incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract.

I. Claim Rejections

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; claims 3, 6-8, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Amro et al. (U.S. 5,515,486); claims 5 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of Imai et al. (U.S. 5,850,213); claims 11, 14-16, 19, 20, 38, 39, 44, 45, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of Hoarty (U.S. 5,485,197); claims 13, 37, 43 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of Hoarty, and further in view of Imai et al.; claims 17, 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of Hoarty, and further in view of Suzuoki et al. (U.S. 5,949,969); claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of

Hoarty and Suzuoki et al., and further in view of Visvanathan et al. (U.S. 6,359,643); and claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al. in view of Hoarty and Imai et al., and further in view of Suzuoki et al.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and to more clearly define the novel features of the present invention, claims 3, 5-8, 11, 13-22, 24, 25 and 27-48 have been canceled, and are replaced with new claims 49 and 50. Applicants submit that the new claims have been drafted to ensure compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that the above-mentioned prior art rejections are inapplicable to the new claims for at least the following reasons.

New claims 49 and 50 recite that the display in a way of shifting from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when the selection input is received by the selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of the program executed by the program execution means, is performed by an animation display. Applicants respectfully submit that the above-noted prior art references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such at least this feature of claims 49 and 50.

Regarding the Amro reference, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method for displaying a panel container, wherein in response to a command from a user, the panel container can be rotated about an axis (see col. 2, lines 12-21). For example, as shown in Fig. 3, the panel container 300 includes multiple panels, each panel having a plurality of icons (see col. 3, lines 27-33). In Amro, when a user clicks on one of the panels, the panels rotate such that a different panel is located in the central front position (see col. 3, lines 46-62).

Regarding the Hoarty reference, Applicants note that this reference discloses a carousel display system in which a carousel menu is presented to the user (see Fig. 35-41). As explained in Hoarty, the displayed carousel can be rotated in order to display additional options to the user (see Abstract).

Based on the foregoing description of Amro and Hoarty, Applicants note that while each of these references discloses the ability to rotate an object having multiple panels by having a user click on the object, that neither Amro nor Hoarty includes any disclosure or suggestion that the display in the way of shifting from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when a selection input is received by a selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of a program executed by a program execution means, is performed by an animation display, as recited in new claims 49 and 50.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining prior art references cited by the Examiner do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Amro and Hoarty.

For example, regarding the Imai reference, it is noted that this reference discloses an apparatus in which the motion of an image is controlled by a track ball and a rotary ring, wherein the amount of rotation of track ball 21 is detected by an X counter 23 and a Y counter 24 (see col. 5, lines 23-25). Regarding the Suzuki reference, it is noted that this reference discloses an image processing method which involve storing moving image data in a texture area of an image memory and mapping a texture of the moving image onto the surface of the object stored in a drawing area (see col. 2, lines 16-24). Lastly, regarding the Visvanathan reference, it is noted that this reference discloses a system having the ability to extract a still image from a continuous stream of video (see col. 2, lines 26-27).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the above-noted feature recited in newly submitted claims 49 and 50 which sets forth that the display in a way of shifting from a screen display in which the three-dimensional rotation body object is displayed at a time when the selection input is received by the selection input means, to a full-screen display which is a program execution screen of the program executed by the program execution means, is performed by an animation display.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 49 and 50 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenjiro TSUDA et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/dib
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 29, 2006